

GRAUSTARK

#338

74GO, 74HQ, 75H, 75AP, 75CQ, 75ET, 75GW

29 November 1975

1975HQ

"Fall 1906"

ITALIAN CONQUEST OF TURKEY COMPLETE

ENGLAND (Robinson): F Nrg-Nwy; F Iri-Wal;
A Liv-Edi.

FRANCE (Lariton): F Mid-Spa(s.c.); A Mar S
F Mid-Spa(s.c.); A Bur S A Mar; A Pic-
Bel; F Bre-Eng.

GERMANY (McCullam): A Ruh-Bur; F Nth-Bel;
F Lon-Eng; A Tyr-Mun; A Sil-Mun; A St.P
& A War S A Mos; A Mos S A War.

ITALY (Drakert): A Ank-Con; F Smy S A Ank-
Con; A Ven holds; A Pie-Mar; F Lyo S A
Pie-Mar; F Wes-Spa(s.c.).

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (McKeon): A Alb-Tri; A Vie
S A Alb-Tri; A Gal & A Ukr hold; A Bud S
A Gal; A Rum S A Ukr; A Sev S A Ukr; F
Bla S A Sev.

RUSSIA (Squires): A Arm-Sev.

Underlined moves are not possible.
France retreats A Mar-Gas. The High Com-
batant Powers now control the following
supply centers:

ENGLAND: Edi, Liv, Nwy. (3)

FRANCE: Bre, Par, Por, Spa. (4)

GERMANY: Bel, Ber, Den, Hol, Kie, Lon,
Mos, Mun, St.P, Swe, War. (11)

ITALY: Ank, Con, Mar, Nap, Rom, Smy, Tun,
Ven. (8)

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: Bud, Bul, Gre, Rum, Ser,
Sev, Tri, War. (8)

Germany may build three new units, and
Italy may build two. France must remove
one unit, and the Turkish A Arm is removed.
The deadline for these "Winter 1906" moves
is NOON, SATURDAY 20 DECEMBER 1975.

"Winter 1906" moves have already come
in from one of these players; if I hear
from the other two quickly I will send
these builds and removals around to all
players, and re-set the "Spring 1907" move
deadline for 20 December. Ron Robinson is
now playing England.

1974GO

A COUPLE OF DAYS AFTER THE "Spring
1908" MOVES ON PAGE 10 WERE PRINTED, MARK
ZIMMERMANN SENT IN REVISED MOVES. THESE
SUPERSEDE THE ADJUDICATION PRINTED ON PAGE
10.

The following Austro-Hungarian moves
are different: "A Gal-Boh; A Rum-Gal; A
Sev-Ukr; A Mos S ENGLISH A St.P". As a re-
sult the French "A Tyr-Boh" fails, and this
unit is dislodged and annihilated by the
Austro-Hungarian attack from Tri. The Eng-
lish A War is not attacked or dislodged.

The deadline for "Fall 1908" moves re-
mains SATURDAY 20 DECEMBER 1975.

1975GW

"Spring 1902"

LOW DEEDS IN THE LOW COUNTRIES

ENGLAND (Spiegel): F Nwy holds; F Lon-Eng;
F Nth S F Lon-Eng; A Edi-Yor.

FRANCE (Bowman): A Pic-Bel; F Eng S A Pic-
Bel; F Bre S F Eng; A Spa holds.

GERMANY (Sergeant): A Ber holds; A Kie-Ruh;
A Mun-Bur; F Den-Swe; A Hol S FRENCH A
Pic-Bel.

ITALY (Douglas Dalman): F Nap-Ion; F Tun-
Wes; A Ven-Pie; A Apu-Ven.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Trtek): F Tri-Alb; A Ser
S*RUSSIAN F Rum; A Vie-Gal; A Bud S A
Vie-Gal.

RUSSIA (Ilves): A St.P & F Swe hold; A War-
Gal; A Ukr S A War-Gal; F Rum-Bla; F Sev
S F Rum-Bla.

TURKEY (Girsdansky): A Bul-Ser; A Con-Bul;
A Arm-Smy; F Bla-Con.

Underlined moves are not possible.
Turkey must retreat F Bla-Ank or F Bla-Arm;
the direction of this retreat should be sent
(continued on p. 4)

1975

LAND RUSH IN EASTERN EUROPE

"Spring 1904"

ENGLAND (Ripper): F St.P(n.c.)-Nwy; F Fin-Bot; F Mid-Por; F Bre-Pic; A Bel S F Bre-Pic; F Eng-Mid; F NAT-S F Eng-Mid.

FRANCE (Haas): A Bur-Mar; A Pic-Bur; A Par S A Pic-Bur; F Wes-Spa(s.c.).

GERMANY (Wienczek): A Liv-Mos; A War-Sil; A Pru-Ber; A Kie S A Pru-Ber; A Mun holds; F Swe-Den; A Gas-Bur.

ITALY (Kramer): A Vie-Gal; A Tri-Vie; A Ven-Tri; F Alb-Adr; F Tun-Tyr; F Nap S F Tun-Tyr.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Lipton): A Bud hlds.

RUSSIA (Hendry): A Sil-Ber; F Bal S A Sil-Ber

TURKEY (Bowman): A Con-Bul; A Ser-Alb; A Rum-Sev; F Ion-Tyr; F Eas-Ion; F Gre & F Aeg S F Eas-Ion.

Underlined moves are not possible. The deadline for "Fall 1904" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 20 DECEMBER 1975.

1975H

"Fall 1905"

ITALIAN OFFENSIVE BLOCKED

Following "Spring 1905" moves England retreated F Edi-Nrg.

ENGLAND (Verheiden): A Lon holds; F Nrg S F Nwy; F Nwy S RUSSIAN F Swe-Ska.

FRANCE (Heuer): A Spa & A Bre hold; A Pic-Bel; A Ruh-Kie; A Mar-Bur.

GERMANY (Chafetz): A Bel holds; A Kie-Mun; F Den-Nth; F Edi-Nrg; A Liv-Edi; F Eng S ITALIAN F Mid-Bre.

ITALY (Lariton): F Mid-Spa(n.c.); A Tus-Pie; A Tyr S A Tus-Pie; A Rom-Ven; F Con-Bla; F Smy-Cor; A Bul S F Smy-Con; A Gal-Ukr; A Rum S A Gal-Ukr; A Bud S A Rum.

RUSSIA (Cathcart): F Sev-Bla; A Ukr holds; A War S A Ukr; A St.P-Nwy; F Swe S A St.P-Nwy.

TURKEY (Silver): F Ank-Bla; A Ber S FRENCH A Ruh-Mun.

Underlined moves are not possible. England must retreat F Nwy-Bar or F Nwy-Ska; this retreat should be submitted with the "Winter 1905" moves, which may be made conditional upon its direction. The High Combatant Powers now control the following supply centers:

ENGLAND: Lon. (1)

FRANCE: Bre, Kie, Mar, Par, Por, Spa. (6)

GERMANY: Bel, Den, Edi, Hol, Liv, Mun. (6)

ITALY: Bud, Bul, Con, Gre, Nap, Rom, Rum,

Ser, Smy, Tri, Tun, Ven, Vie. (13)

RUSSIA: Mos, Nwy, St.P, Sev, Swe, War. (6)

TURKEY: Ank, Ber. (2)

Italy may build two new units and Russia and France may each build one. England must remove two units. (Italy still has one fewer units than supply centers, since a home supply center is occupied.) The deadline for these "Winter 1905" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 20 DECEMBER 1975.

*

A postal Diplomacy game limited to residents of New York City is now in the process of organization, and needs three more players. The regular postal rules and deadlines will be used, but retreats, builds, and removals will be sent out to all players by phone. The game fee is \$10. Players should send in with the game fee, a list of the countries that they'd like to play, in order of preference. See GRAUSTARK #318 for the rules of postal Diplomacy.

1975AP

3

"Winter 1904-Spring 1905"

RUSSO-AUSTRIAN DETENTE?

The German order "A Hol holds", reported among the "Fall 1904" moves in GRAUSTARK #337, should have been "A Bel holds". Following "Fall 1904" moves, Germany retreated F Lon-Nth, F Kie-Hel. Austria-Hungary built A Bud & A Vie, and Russia built F St.P (n.c.), A Mos & A War. These moves were passed on to all players.

ENGLAND (David Dalman): F Kie, F Wal & F Lon hold.

GERMANY (Michal): A Bre-Pic; A Bel-Hol; F Edi-Yor; F Nth S F Edi-Yor; F Hel S A Bel-Hol; A Mun holds.

ITALY (Eisen): F Eng-Iri; A Mar-Pie; F Spa(n.c.)-Mid; F Alb-Tri; A Ven & F Adr S F Alb-Tri; F Ion-Apu.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Murray): A Tyr-Pie; A Tri & A Gre hold; A Vie & A Bud S A Tri; A Ser S A Gre; A Con-Bul; F Smy-Aeg.

RUSSIA (Cathcart): A Nwy-Swe; F St.P(n.c.)-Nwy; F Den-Hel; F Bal-Den; A Ber S ENGLISH F Kie; A War-Sil; A Pru S A War-Sil; A Mos-St.P; F Rum-Bla; A Ank-Arm.

Underlined moves are not possible. The deadline for "Fall 1905" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 20 DECEMBER 1975.

1975ET

"Spring 1903"

TURCO-AUSTRIAN ALLIANCE!

ENGLAND (Penn): F Nat-Mid; F Bre S F Nat-Mid; F Por-Spa(s.c.); A Gas S F Por-Spa(s.c.); F Lon-Eng; F Nwy-Nrg.

GERMANY (Squires): A Bel S A Hol; A Hol S A Bel, A Mun-Sil; A Ber S A Mun-Sil; A Kie-Mun; A Par-Bur; F Den holds.

ITALY (Lerman): F Spa(s.c.) & A Pie hold; A Mar S F Spa(s.c.); F Wes-Lyo; F Tun-Wes; F Nap-Tyr.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Rittel): A Gal S TURKISH A Rum-Ukr; A Vie S A Gal; A Tyr-Mun; A Tri-Bid; A Bul-Ser; F Ion holds.

RUSSIA (Birsan): A Liv S A War; A War & A Mos S A Ukr; A Ukr S TURKISH A Rum-Gal.

TURKEY (Remmele): A Rum-Ukr; A Sev S A Rum-Ukr; F Bla S A Sev; F Aeg-Con.

Underlined moves are not possible. One player has proposed calling the game a draw at this point, so a vote is called for. A unanimous vote is required in order for a draw; if one player refuses or abstains, it will not take place. The deadline for "Fall 1903" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 20 DECEMBER 1975.

*

Stephen Haas, P. O. Box 639, Livingston Manor, N. Y. 12758 has the following SPI games for sale in good used condition at \$5 each: Breakout & Pursuit, JCA, Korea, Moscow Campaign, NATO, and Spitfire. He also has Avalon-Hill's Afrika Corps at this price. Or he's willing to trade for SPI's Search & Destroy, Sniper, or Tank.

Paul Girsdansky, P. O. Box 146, Springfield Center, N. Y. 13468 also has used SPI games to sell. World War III is \$6 and Franco-Prussian War and Wolfpack are \$5 in boxed form, plus 50¢ postage. In folio form at \$4 are The East Is Red and Frederick the Great, and at \$3.50 are Oil War and Wurzburg; postage for folios is 25¢ additional. He also has Strategy & Tactics #42 at \$2 plus 10¢ postage.

1975GW (continued from p. 1)

to the Gamesmaster at once, and he will inform the other players. The deadline for "Fall 1902" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 20 DECEMBER 1975.

VIENNA: Shock waves rebounded throughout Europe as Franz Josef granted full press autonomy to Hungary. The two spokesmen who appeared before reporters did not elaborate. One, Henry Thimb, was unable to get past the word "morning". The other, a frizzy-haired person named Pinky, said nothing but honked a horn in three-quarter time. Later, a printed bulletin from the office of the propaganda minister, Count Wagstaff-Firefly, explained that "one set of press releases will cover Austrian interests. The other, datelined Budapest, will provide independent coverage of Hungarian affairs." Most observers believe, however, that the move is actually part of a plan to give Austria-Hungary twice the normal amount of press coverage and therefore effectively crush the recent challenge of Russian journalists who have chosen to bait the Dual Monarchy. A high government official was heard to mutter, "Wait until the Ruskies feel both barrels shoved up their collective ass!"

BUDAPEST: Montenegro Great Movies (MGM) today announced unearthing from its film vault a mint copy of the Marx Brothers movie Chicken Shit, formerly believed lost. Coming on the heels of Horsefeathers, Monkey Business, and Duck Soup, the film, made by the brothers during a summer idyll in the Balkans, is expected for a fall release and promises to be the celluloid event of the year.

MUNICH (1 May 1902): It has come to the attention of the Kaiser that commitments are being made in his name, of which he has no knowledge. If things continue in this vein, he will have no choice but to unleash Germany's secret weapon, the elves of the Black Forest. If certain nations do not want to wake up in the morning to find their countries buried beneath a pile of green shoes with silver buckles, they had best refrain from press releases of this ilk.

NAPLES: The Grand Italian War College announced today that any rumors to the effect that the Italian Army is training by raising both hands high in the air and screaming "I surrender!" in six (6) different languages is untrue. The spokesman said that these were malicious, unfounded, and without any basis of support.

BOLOGNA: The State Department today announced that contrary to vicious rumors, the Italian Army was not invading Austria-Hungary. Reasons cited were the harsh climate (it gets cold there) and the fact that the world's best wall paperer is an Austrian. It was stated that if the Italians do go to war it will be where the soldiers can 1) chase women and 2) get a good suntan and 3) drink lots of wine.

WOGASTISBURGER-NEUSTADT (13 June 1902): Obermajor Hans Pfeffertopf, leader of the Conservative Liberal Imperialist Party, today demanded in the Landnacht that the Grand Duchy of Wogastisburg-Schlumpenbittel break diplomatic relations with the Austro-Hungarian Empire. "I hold here in my hand," he told the Grand Duchy's legislative assembly, "positive proof that the Austro-Hungarian government, and particularly the Ministry of Propaganda, have been infiltrated by Marxists. These proofs, obtained at great personal hazard by a heroic intelligence agent named Leonardo Chicolini-Baravelli, demonstrate that Marxism is rampant in the Dual Monarchy."

This fiery speech was greeted with loud snores of approval by most of the Landnacht. However, Count Inghaus, leader of the Progressive Loyalist Reactionary Party, objected to this proposal. "While I reject the irreverent and anarchistic doctrine of Marxism as strongly as any loyal Wogastisburger should," he said, "it should be pointed out that the Grand Duchy is a fief of the Holy Roman Empire. A good case can be made in international law that the Austro-Hungarian Empire is the successor at law of the Holy Roman Empire. This being the case, Obermajor Pfeffertopf's proposal, though presented in good faith, may well be an act of treason."

DRZUNKDUMP, PUNDSDHUK (15 June 1902): Prime Minister Gottlieb Andronikos Istvan Orkhan Dombrowski today made an indignant protest to the announcement from Budapest about "Montenegro Great Movies". "It is well known that no such place as Montenegro exists," he said, "It is an imaginary country, invented by certain irresponsible Italian journalists as a vehicle for satire against the Four And A Half Kingdoms, and particularly against the Kingdom of Pundschdruk. We also suspect an American named Stout of having a hand in this hoax."

THE DIPLOMATIC POUCH

((Where known, dates of letters are given. The editor's comments are enclosed in double brackets.))

LAURENCE J. P. GILLESPIE: It has been brought to my attention that my reference to the ripoff artists in another "important diplomatic association" could be construed as an attack on The Diplomacy Association. This was not my original intention though I can see that it might appear as such to some people. After thinking it over carefully, I can't really think of any genuine reasons why TDA would merit such an attack, despite its very murky reputation in some circles. One must remember that people like myself tend to get their first view of hobby politics through the 'zines they enter initially and in my case I heard so much from IDA 'zines that I tended to forget that there might be another side to the story. This is a particularly acute problem in Canadian diplomatic circles, where there is really no such thing as a TDA supporting 'zine. Of late this imbalance has begun to reverse itself with several 'zines taking the approach that both organizations have their merits, though none have gone quite so far as GRAUSTARK to soundly condemn the IDA. And of course I can't speak for anything that happened prior to 1971, as my 'zines don't go back any farther. So I am sorry for any damage done.

((Right now, the strongest condemnations of IDA members are being printed in 'zines published by IDA members. I would like to take this opportunity to refute a nasty rumor that is going around. You do not have to be ineligible in order to run for office in IDA. It helps, of course, but it's not an absolute necessity.))

Do you HONESTLY believe the USA will ever make any further attempt to contain communism, after the debacle in Viet Nam? ((If launching two nuclear-powered aircraft carriers won't convince you - and the attendant rhetoric upon their launching - what will?)) Also, isn't it true that about half the leaders mentioned on the first page of GRAUSTARK #329 are isolationists to varying degrees? I don't claim to know the inner views of every American politician but at least Kennedy, McGovern and at times even Humphrey sound extremely isolationist, though perhaps in the 1950's the above characters held different views. ((All eight of those Senators were members of Congress in 1964, and as such voted for the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, which Attorney-General Katzenbach called "the constitutional equivalent of a declaration of war". Vice-President Humphrey also called the war "a wonderful adventure". The imperial interests of the United States of America are safe in the hands of such men as these.)) Also, you have an interesting view of the state of American pacifist sentiment. Isn't it something of an oversimplification to believe students and radicals are scared of reprisals? I admit that it is probably true that a large portion of the "peace" movement may have been composed of cowards and slackers not willing to serve their country but the hard core communist heart of the anti-war movement wasn't particularly scared of the government in the 1960's and isn't now. It is simply that with the removal of the draft (conscription, etc.) the war in Indochina or anywhere else for that matter no longer means anything to the vast bulk of students, young people, etc, that would normally compose the backbone of the "antiwar" movement. Reintroduce the draft and I'd be willing to bet my life on the revival of the radicalism of the sixties with all its trappings. ((Maybe, but the students wouldn't be willing to bet their lives - particularly when this term is not a metaphor but literal fact. Besides, the draft is not dead. The Selective Service Act is still in effect, and men are still required to "register for it.)) Such a process would occur no matter what the cause the US would be militarily defending at the time. If the US ever commits conscript units to the land defense of Israel (Lord Forbid!) the cry of the "antiwar" movement will be "Heil Hitler" instead of "Peace", which would amount to the same thing. If the regs were so nutty as to ever launch an invasion of Canada the newspapers in the states would be working overtime finding faults in the corrupt regime of Thieudeau or Lon Bourassa (assuming Canada is in two parts by then). And so on.

((This is not how matters have worked out in practice. At the campus where I teach, it is physically dangerous for anyone to criticize US policy in the Middle East; twice it was necessary to call the police to get such a speaker off the campus in one piece. The American student population is, after all, not the same people who demonstrated against

their country's imperial destiny in the 1960's. But they know what happens to people who try this stunt, and they decidedly do not want it to happen to them. See for further details the remark by Herbert Hendin, quoted on p. 9 of GRAUSTARK #336. And wouldn't "Heil Hitler!" be a rather peculiar chant from "the hard-core communist heart of the anti-war movement"??)

If you genuinely fear for your safety if you do not hold views acceptable to the people leading your country, I would strongly advise you to start learning Russian and recommence quoting from obscure left wing publications, as that sort of thing will come in quite handy eight or nine years from now, and it's best to get an early start. GRAUSTARK can still replace the other imitator 'zines in this field as king. Assuming America isn't a radioactive wasteland by then, someone with your considerable powers of persuasion could probably obtain permission for such mundane things as postal Diplomacy journals (of the acceptable political alignment of course) to continue when the real "1984" arrives. Just don't throw away all your early years of anti Americanism (prior to issue #100) by backing what is clearly the wrong horse. Your American "Empire" is in its death throes.

(Oh, quite the contrary. What has been in death throes is President Allende, King Faisal, Sheikh Rahman, and various other people who thought they could pursue lines of conduct contrary to the interest and wishes of the United States of America. Right now, in Washington, some of the Senators we were talking about on the last page have been conducting hearings on US covert intelligence operations around the world. The opponents of the American Empire are having their noses rubbed in the fact that their words are being taken down, and their deeds are being assessed, and if they don't shape up, they'll be shipped out. An Empire that has lost the will to survive and fight doesn't manufacture nuclear missiles, aircraft carriers, or shellfish toxin.))

RICHARD GREENWELL ((24 April 1975)): I have been following your "editorials" in EMPIRE on American foreign policy, Nixon, etc. As a Canadian, I found them interesting. Since my "patriotism" to the United States shouldn't be an issue ((Wanna bet!)) I thought I might as well comment:

(a) NIXON: His "illness" did not prevent him from giving nuclear reactors to Egypt. As for "impeachment"; well, any constitutional system based on the English system (pre-1776) can point to the example of Charles I. Absolute monarchs went out of fashion (constitutionally) with Charles I. The only difference between Nixon and Charles I is, that Nixon did not lose his head (and got a Pardon). Which was the more humane solution is debatable.

((To this day, people are willing to argue that King Charles I was illegally attacked, resisted, deposed, and executed. As you might expect, a historian's views on this matter agree well with the historian's own political leanings: liberals, radicals, and Marxists approve of what was done to the king; conservatives and reactionaries deplore it. In the works somewhere is a history of the era inadequately called 'Water-gate' which will defend President Nixon's counter-espionage activities and attack the impeachment managers as Clarendon or Frith attacked the signers of King Charles' death-warrant.))

(b) President Ford: Well, I like Gerry! But then, he is supposed to be an admirer of Truman. Since Truman is the only American President (since WWII) whom I've liked, I will give him the benefit of a doubt.

((That's odd - Truman did in Korea exactly what Johnson did in Vietnam, and yet many of the people who despise the latter admire the former!))

(c) EMPIRE: I believe only "revisionist" historians maintain there is an American Empire. Since you seem to accept that premise, could it be that you are actually a "sheep in wolf's clothing"?

((The existence of the American Empire does not depend upon whether some individual historian chooses to accept or deny it. It's there; its physical evidences span this globe; it is the great reality with which the government of every other nation has to deal. As for "wolf's clothing", it's the only thing sensible to wear these days.))

((7 May 1975)) Charles I had two trials. The first was aimed more against his Ministers and in effect said that even a King cannot break the law. The second was treason, etc. It was a trump-up trial, since they had pretty well decided to get rid of him. Of

course, Charles I was a bit of a nuisance, too. ((The precise words were "tyrant, traitor, murderer, and public enemy.")) His second trial came just after he had tried to get the Scots to send an army to restore his rights (which Parliament and the courts had struck down). Of course, Charles wasn't very bright, since he was in over his head. Then his executioners weren't all that bright either since England became a sort of Black Sheep of Europe (for killing its king). Neither side came out ahead in the long run. Cromwell's Roundheads ruled for little over 12 years and then came the Restoration of the Monarchy (1660). Similarly, Charles I's successors and his supporters did not "win" either, since the monarchy after 1660 was limited (much like after Charles' first trial) and since then the Royal Prerogative has declined further.

((Yes, they had their Restoration - and then found by 1688 that they had to do Cromwell's work all over again. "Those who do not learn from history are condemned to repeat it."))

As for Nixon, well I thought he was the 'best' candidate in '72 (of course, McGovern was an ass, so that doesn't probably say much for Nixon.) ((On the contrary, it says a great deal for President Nixon. By sabotaging the campaigns of his more serious adversaries, President Nixon and his staff arranged the nomination of McGovern, as the most vulnerable possible opponent. This was an act of brilliance unprecedented in American political life, and one that will probably be repeated next year.)) I also thought Nixon was innocent. (I don't now.) ((President Ford does. His is the opinion that matters.)) After all, why spy on the Democrats. They were doing a pretty good job of blowing the election, so what was the point. As for the Plumbers, 'Dirty Tricks', etc., well, that's not very democratic (and I thought the KGB, etc. was the one who did that). Somehow I doubt if history will judge Nixon kindly.

((This assumption, which I've heard elsewhere, assumes that the Vietnam-Watergate era was an 'aberration' in American history, which is now over and will never recur. Since the people who planned and supported both the Vietnam War and the Watergate counter-espionage operation are still in power, I believe that the present breast-beating is the 'aberration', and that American Presidents will continue to exercise their sole prerogatives to direct the destiny of the American Empire. Congress will either accede to this situation realistically, or cease to exist as anything except a forum in which the relative merits of Maine and Idaho potatoes, or Vermont and Wisconsin butter, are argued.

((The show-down may be triggered by Congress's present idiotic attempt to cite Prime Minister Kissinger and Secretary of Commerce Morton for contempt. This is the first time they have ever tried this stunt against members of the President's cabinet. Of course, it will not be permitted, and unless Congress backs down this may well trigger the confrontation that was averted in 1974 by President Nixon's illness and consequent resignation.

((Eventually, of course, Congress will dig in its heels somewhere and be hauled off, kicking and screaming, to the trash-can of history. It will then be seen that President Nixon's policies, subsumed under the name 'Watergate', were the wave of America's future. Historians with an eye to their own best interests will then present President Nixon's policies and actions in a far more friendly light than contemporary journalists and politicians are now doing.))

I'm too young to remember the 'Who lost China?' debate, but China has always fascinated me (so much so that I did my Master's on the Sino-Soviet Dispute). I would say the answer to that question (on 'Who lost Vietnam?') is the Chinese (or Vietnamese). Militarily, the Kuomintang, South Vietnamese army (and even the French at Dienbienphu) made the same mistake. They overextended themselves in Manchuria (Chiang) and the Central Highlands (Thieu). At the same time, they were out-generated by the other side and their armies were routed. Politically, both Chiang and Thieu had narrow political bases (mainly their army) and once the armies disintegrated their positions became untenable. As for the United States, well I think you did enough and to do more would not have been worth the cost. As for Israel, well I hope you are wrong. I would not like to see Israel destroyed (though sometimes I wish they would be more flexible). Time would seem to be on the side of the Arabs; but after Vietnam's fall I wouldn't blame the Israelis for being careful.

((Don't worry about Israel's survival; for details see the article on current Middle Eastern armies and their capabilities in Strategy & Tactics #53.))

This is

O At
P Great
E Intervals
R This
A Appears
T To
I Inflame
O Optic
N Nerves

676

DAVE DALMAN: I have heard that the Southern States get more federal money than they pay in Federal taxes. While New York pays more Federal taxes than it receives back.

((This is correct, though the precise numbers differ depending on the source.))

I believe that Southerners are against aid to New York, because Southerners just plain 'hate' Yankees. For example, during the fuel shortage the move or attempted move by Southerners to keep oil and gas in their home states.

((To anyone who's been reading Evan Jones' reports of contemporary local opinion at Tulane University, this comes as no surprise.))

Ford hopes to gain votes by leading a hate campaign against New York. I can only hope that backfires on Ford & Friends. It is shameful that in times of crisis that someone should try to profit off the misery of others. It is also a shame in this country that we have no leaders, just rulers. That there is no one with the ability to go first, so lead the way; that, all we have is people giving orders and taking no risks.

((One of the risks they aren't taking is the risk that someone will not follow these orders. I suggest you follow the orders; as you say, they are rulers.))

I feel that New York's problems are caused more by Federal programs and that New York should be congratulated for putting off disaster, not shot down because of its problems.

((Thanks for the kind words. However, I see no point in blaming the federal government in this matter. Federal programs, chiefly military, are the cause why New York City sends more tax money to Washington than ever gets back. However, the government has made it quite clear that it is not going to hear or accept complaints about its military programs, and that if it answers these complaints, it will answer them with a burst of gunfire. We're not going to buck that.))

((The federal government is now asking for guarantees, and for hard deeds, on New York's part which will show that the city and state are going to exercise fiscal responsibility. Only then will help be forthcoming. Vice President Rockefeller set the matter out concisely in a speech at Little Rock on 12 September. He said, "One of the problems in this country is that we have this Judeo-Christian heritage of wanting to help those in need. And this, when added to some political instincts, sometimes causes people to promise more than they can deliver. And I think this nation has overpromised, underdelivered, overspent, and now we're in financial trouble." (New York Post, 13 September 1975))

((Here is a clear message as to what the federal government expects of us. If the city of New York is serious about restoring financial stability, it will forbid the exercise of the Christian and Jewish religions. Freed from this drain on our finances, the city will be restored to fiscal solidity.))

PETER A. BERGGREN (26 October 1975): You seem to confuse the statements of IDA's president, Edi Birsan, with the official policy of IDA. ((So does he.)) Several people have tried to explain this to you, but you remain ignorant. Let me spell it out: No-thing Edi Birsan says is official IDA policy, only acts, bills, etc. passed by the council are considered such. If Edi quotes to you from a specific bill passed by council, that is the only time he is relating the views of the International Diplomacy Association.

You criticize IDA for not ostracizing ((sic)) rip off artists, yet the only one who knows for sure whether or not IDA does the same thing is John Beshara! I haven't seen TDA attacking these people, although I think it should. And what good would my now-relinquished membership in TDA be towards this end? None, since TDA follows only the wishes of John Beshara and the members be damned! Case in point: what happened to the elections that TDA members were promised many years ago?

((IDA's founder Larry Peery claimed, without benefit of elections, that he was West Coast chairman of TDA and that money should be sent to him. He also claimed that his Veritas Vincit was an attempt to drive John out of Diplomacy fandom, and admitted as much in a letter which I published in GRAUSTARK #250, reprinted from VV a Fini. His stated intention to distribute VV to the TDA membership was the reason why a membership list was not at the time published - why provide customers for a thing like that? VV is basic to an understanding of why and how IDA operates; prospective members should try to get hold of a copy if they can and see for themselves. (However, I rather doubt that it's available from IDA these days. If, as IDA claims, it's a fast-growing plant, it's because there's a lot of shit heaped around its roots.))

((VV, incidentally, was bankrolled by Walt Buchanan, and warmly endorsed by Len LaRocca, Odd Rod Walker, and other IDA honchos.))

For the benefit of the readers: Edi Birsan went over all this and more in his exhaustive and concise letter to John Boardman, dated June 4-5, 1975. John refused to print it, for reasons which are not clear to me. ((That's because no such refusal took place. From its arrival through September I printed only one page of letters. By the next time I prepared a letter column, for #335 on 27 September, I arranged it by the overly simple expedient of just pulling letters out of the file until I'd filled the space. Edi's letter wasn't among them, and I cannot now find it. Edi was next seen complaining in En Passant that I'd "refused" to print his letter.

((Actually, that's just as well. It's in En Passant, so now I don't have to print it, and can do news despatches from the Four And A Half Kingdoms, which is what the readers would prefer anyhow.)) What I want to know is why, when John can find room for plenty of his own editorial in every issue, can't he give the person who is largely the subject of his editorials at least equal space?

((Because I find Birsan's attempt to drive John Beshara out of Diplomacy fandom tiresome in the extreme. The man who, as a TDA officer, failed to answer any of John's letters or otherwise tend to his duties, has no right to accuse John of 'taking over' the organization. John Beshara 'took over' TDA because Edi Birsan did nothing at all in or for it, and somebody had to.

((Besides, Birsan and Warden belong together. In En Passant #64, Warden claimed that I had supported one of the most unreliable and dishonest Gamesmasters in the hobby, Buddy Tretick. There is no word of truth in this.))

NO DOUBLE STANDARD

Recently, Ambassador Daniel P. Moynihan has begun to campaign against the nations who have dared to criticize the United States of America in the United Nations, and yet whose own records are not free from criticism. It is his contention, and thus our country's, that these nations are showing hypocrisy by criticizing alleged violations of human rights in the United States of America and its subject allies, while having political prisoners of their own.

So far, all well and good. But now, in an editorial of 14 November 1975, the New York Post stuck its comments into the Ambassador's call for "an unconditional amnesty ((for)) all political prisoners". Typically, the editorial objected to "gross U. S. deficiencies in that connection, especially those arising from punitive, unrelenting reprisals against Vietnam war resisters."

This editorial is nonsense if we consider just what the words "political prisoner" mean. The chief political duty of every human being, American or not, is the maintenance and extension of America's imperial role in the world. (The proof of this statement is obvious, if you consider what happens to people who maintain the contrary.) Consequently, those people who are in jail or exile for such activities are properly entitled to the label "political prisoner". It would be a complete inversion of the term's meaning to apply it to people who have resisted America's imperial destiny, or denied that it exists.

In the Soviet Union and in many other countries there are those brave men and women who realize that if their nations attempt to resist America's insuperable power it will only bring disaster. Accordingly, they work to make their countries subservient to the eventual American domination over the entire human species. (If this is not the case, then it would be impossible to explain why we are being asked to give sympathy and support to the Solzhenitsyns and Sakharovs.) These are political prisoners, and Ambassador Moynihan's proposal of "unconditional amnesty" is only what they deserve. This is dutifully echoed by Leonard Garment, the chief United States representative to the UN Human Rights Commission, who asserts that such an amnesty could not possibly apply to the objects of the Post's concern, those Americans who refused the high privilege of setting their lives on the line to assure their country's destiny.

No double standard is involved if the United States of America helps those who support it, and rejects those who reject it. This latter category, a certain publisher should be reminded, could easily come to include the New York Post.

1974GO

"Winter 1907-Spring 1908"

WHERE ARE ALL THOSE FRENCHMEN GOING?

Following "Fall 1907" moves, France built F Bre & A Par, Italy removed F Tyr and is now out of the game, Austria-Hungary built A Vie, and Turkey removed A Arm. All players were informed of these "Winter 1907" moves, and asked whether they would like to send in the "Spring 1908" moves to speed the game along. They proceeded to send in these moves, which all arrived by nine days before the deadline. (This page is being printed early and will be sent out to them in case they want to accelerate the game still further.)

ENGLAND (Doyle): F Bar-Nrg; F Nth-Hol; F Bal-Den; F Hel S F Bal-Den; F Bot-Bal; A Sil-Ber; A War-Sil; A Liv-Pru; A St.P-Nwy.

FRANCE (Amer): A Par-Pic; F Bre-Eng; F Eng-Wal; A Bel S A Hol; A Hol S A Ruh-Kie; A Ruh-Kie; A Kie-Bar; A Mun S A Kie-Ber; A Tyr-Boh; A Ven holds; F Rom-Tyr; F Tun-Ion; F Nap S F Tun-Ion.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Zimmermann): A Tri-Tyr; A Vie S A Tri-Tyr; A Ser-Tri; A Gal-War; A Mos S A Gal-War; A Rum-Ukr; A Sev S A Mos.

TURKEY (Drakert): A Gre-Alb; F Con-Aeg; A Bul S F Aeg-Gre; F Aeg-Gre; F Eas-Ion.

Underlined moves are not possible. England retreats A War-Liv. The deadline for "Fall 1908" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 20 DECEMBER 1975, but they'll be gratefully accepted and adjudicated prior to that date.

As just about everyone has probably figured out by now, France has 13 supply centers rather than the figure of "11" given after the listing of those 13 in the last issue.

* GRAUSTARK, the first bulletin of postal Diplomacy, is published on every third Saturday by John Boardman (address below). No games are now open except one limited to residents of New York City, for which the game fee is \$10. Stand-by entries are open at \$5 each; for details about GRAUSTARK house rules and stand-by status see GRAUSTARK #318. Subscriptions are 10 issues for \$2.00; non-players will get their subscription copies in bundles of 3, every 9 weeks, by 3rd-class mail. The following back issues are available: 200, 202, 206, 249, 250, 253, 258, 271, 273, 275, 276, 280, 285, 286, and 291-337. They are all 10 ossies for \$1 except for ## 296, 300, and 315, over-size issues full of book and game reviews, which are 50¢ each.

GRAUSTARK #338

John Boardman
234 East 19th Street
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11226
U. S. A.

F I R S T C L A S S M A I L

In this issue: Stains of leftover turkey, cranberry sauce, stuffing, and pumpkin pie from collators' fingers.